

### REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action dated June 30, 2006. In view of the foregoing amendments and following representations, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Initially, the specification and abstract have been reviewed and revised in order to make a number of minor clarifying and other editorial amendments. Due to the nature of the revision involved, a substitute specification and abstract has been prepared. No new matter has been added. Also enclosed is a "marked-up" copy of the original specification and abstract to show the changes that have been incorporated into the substitute specification and abstract. The enclosed copy is entitled "Version with Markings to Show Changes Made."

On page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Accordingly, claims 1-14 have been cancelled and replaced with new claims 15-26. Each of the new claims has been drafted so as to comply with the provisions of 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. In particular, independent claim 15 clearly sets forth that each top plate unit includes two (first and second) ball-holding cavities. It is submitted that the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph is clearly obviated in view of the presentation of the new claims.

Next, on page 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner indicates that claims 4-5 and 14 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Accordingly, new independent claim 15 has been written to include at least the limitations of allowable claim 4 and base claim 1. Therefore, claim 15 is clearly allowable. Independent claim

26 includes the limitations of claims 1 and 4 but does not recite the distance between the center of the terminal balls relative to the ball-holding cavities as in claim 15. Accordingly, claim 26 is allowable over the prior art of record.

Further, claims 16-25 ultimately depend from allowable claim 15, and are therefore allowable at least by virtue of their dependencies.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the present application is now clearly in condition for allowance. The Examiner therefore is requested to pass this case to issue.

In the event that the Examiner has any comments or suggestions of a nature necessary to place this case in condition for allowance, then the Examiner is requested to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney by telephone to promptly resolve any remaining matters.

Respectfully submitted,

Hiromu MAEDA

By: 

Michael S. Huppert  
Registration No. 40,268  
Attorney for Applicant

MSH/kjf  
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021  
Telephone (202) 721-8200  
Facsimile (202) 721-8250  
October 2, 2006